

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Seventeenth Legislature
26th Day

Thursday, March 30, 1972.

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO WILBERT 4-H CLUB

Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cut Knife): — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure and a privilege for me to introduce to you and all Hon. Members of this Assembly an excited group of some 28 boys and girls of the Wilbert 4-H Club who are seated in the Speaker's Gallery. This is the first time, Mr. Speaker, in the four and one half years as an MLA that I have had a group of this size make the long trip from Cut Knife constituency to this Legislature and I want to congratulate them heartily on their venture today.

Mr. Speaker, the Wilbert 4-H Club which started some 25 years ago by Mr. Don Ferguson is a beef, light horse, junior sportsman and homecraft club and is currently under the leadership of Mr. Lynn Biggart. Also accompanying them here today are Mr. and Mrs. Murray Butterwell, Mrs. Rosalee Reinbolt and Mr. Ole Veickle. I ask all Members to join with me in extending a friendly welcome to this energetic group who travelled some 300 miles to get here. We hope they enjoy their visit to our capital city and particularly to this Legislature and we wish them a safe journey home.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude my remarks today I would like to quote the 4-H pledge as it states:

My head to clear thinking
My heart to greater loyalty
My lands to larger service
My health to better living
For my club, my community and my country.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO NAICAM 4-H CLUB

Mr. A. Thibault (Melfort-Kinistino): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce a fine group of 4-H Club members number in 50 from Naicam district. They are here today led by Mr. Cyril Griffith and their general leader Mr. Vern Volding. They are accompanied by some of their parents and I am sure that I concur with what the Member from Cut Knife has said. Their trip here I hope will be very educational. They have taken in the Centre of the Arts, this evening they are going to the Light Horse Show. I know that their trip to the city is going to be very educational and a happy one. I also want to wish them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to add my words to the Member for Cut Knife in respect to

welcoming the Wilbert 4-H Club, their leaders as well as the 28 members. I'll say to my Hon. friend from Kinistino who just took his seat that I know all of these people very well and I know that community very well. It is one of the finest districts in the country and I would stack up those 28 members against his 50 from Kinistino any day. They are an excellent group, they have done an excellent job through the years and we are certainly glad to see them down here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. E.L. Tchorzewski (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my welcome and best wishes to the multiple 4-H Club from Naicam district. There are some 50 members with the group, members of the Club, parents and leaders. They left early this morning and they have come 150 miles and I want to add to the comments of the Member from Cut Knife in that I think the Naicam 4-H Club has one better over the Wilbert Members' Club in that they have a history of over 30 years of existence. I know that the Members of this House are wishing them a very valuable stay in the House and a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

GRAND CHAMPION SHORTHORN BULL

Mr. E. Kaeding (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I am pleased to announce to the House that a constituent of mine, Mr. Alex Calancie of Calder last night won the grand championship for shorthorn bulls at the Regina Winter Fair and sold the bull this morning at a very satisfactory price of \$5,000.

Another breeder in my constituency, Mr. John Morari of Calder won the best of three bulls. It is very interesting to note that all four of these bulls were sired by the same animal.

I am also pleased to report that the Department of Agriculture was on hand to purchase a number of these good bulls from these herds and I am sure this will help to improve the quality of the breeding stock in our provincial pastures.

I should like this House to join with me in congratulating Mr. Calancie for his success.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL PAYMENTS OUTSIDE OF CANADA

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek). Recently he announced some changes in the rate of payments outside the Province of Saskatchewan. In connection with payments outside of Canada for medical services and hospital, will the present Medical Review Committee still be involved in assessing these cases before the accounts are actually incurred outside of Canada?

Mr. Smishek: — My understanding is that they will.

SCHOOL GRANT ESTIMATES

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Government or the Hon. Member for Canora (Mr. Matsalla) perhaps. I see we still don't have the school grant estimates that have been asked for for some considerable time. As I pointed out to the House yesterday, I know that the Government Members had had them, also school boards, teachers' groups in the province. I wonder, if the Minister hasn't got his departmental copy ready for us, if he would ask the Member for Canora to table the copy he took out of caucus and passed around the province. We could at least have that for the weekend.

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Member from Wilkie, this has been bothering me, really bothering me. I went through the Journals of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and I find that the Liberal Government never tabled a list of school grants in seven years of office.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege, he better go back and look again, because we tabled them every year in this Legislature — the present year Estimates with a comparable table of the last year.

Mr. MacMurchy: — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I checked this morning and I just couldn't find them. I understand that when a list of school grants was provided it was at the discretion of the Minister, they did not present them officially but sometimes they were passed around to the Members a few days before the Estimates came up. It has been a tradition in the seven years that the Education Estimates have generally come near the last of the session.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a good deal of pleasure to table on day number 26 of the sitting the school grants for 1972.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — They are estimates only, they are not completely finalized because we are still meeting with school boards.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, after five different attempts, three promises by the Premier and a couple by the Hon. Minister I wish to take this opportunity to thank him for his tardiness and we appreciate getting them at long last.

CLOSURE OF INDUSTRIES

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I

should like to direct a question in the absence of the Minister of Industry to the Premier regarding the closure of two industries in Saskatoon. I have been attempting to get hold of the owner and the president of Westcore Steel and Saskatoon Iron Works, without success. I have found that their telephone service has been discontinued, that the doors are locked and that it has been indicated that there were 30 employees working in there. I wonder if the Premier can tell me if the Minister of Industry was able to obtain any information in this regard?

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I know the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) was pursuing this. This is a company which has evidently run into financial difficulties. I haven't had an opportunity to check with the Minister of Industry yet as to what the results of his investigations are. So far as I am aware Westcore have not approached the Government for any assistance — I can't remember any approach although I may have had one six or eight months ago, I can't remember that — but I am not aware of any approach to the Government and I understand the Minister is looking into it. I shall ask the Minister to report to the House as soon as he has an opportunity to do so.

Mr. MacDonald: — Just a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, I think it might eliminate this kind of question day by day in the House just as announcements of new industries are made by the Members opposite it might be a good idea in the future to start announcing closures.

Mr. Blakeney: — On the point I think this would be very unwise not because there are going to be so many now but if it had been followed in the past whole periods of the House would have been taken up with the announcements of the many closures.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debates on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that **Bill No. 9 — An Act to provide for the appointment of a Person to Investigate Administrative decisions or acts of Departments of the Government and certain other Organizations and to define the Person's duties, functions and powers** be now read a second time.

He said: Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Your backbenchers have deserted you.

Mr. Romanow: — My backbenchers may have deserted me but I know that they will be back and that can't be said about yours.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I should modify that and say I think they'll be

back.

Mr. Speaker, on passing the principle of the establishment of an Ombudsman this Assembly will be enacting a Bill which I think will be worthy of all legislators of this Assembly. It will be a law which will reflect credit and respect on all Members of this House. I say this will be so because in this legislation we are setting up an office the primary objective of which will be to serve the individual, the ordinary citizen of the Province of Saskatchewan. Any law enacted by any Parliament that seeks to advance the opportunities of protection for our citizens is worthy of everyone's support. Regrettably in Saskatchewan probably unlike anywhere else in any province of Canada where a similar Bill of this nature has been introduced for the benefit of the populace, this Bill is being opposed by a small group of men who sit opposite us in this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, I never thought that this could have happened in 1972 in modern-day Canada. Let me say at the outset that I do not believe this legislation has given the Ombudsman any more or less powers than other Ombudsman Bills in other parts of Canada. In fact this Ombudsman Bill is one of the finest in all Canada with respect to its powers and its duties. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, even if there were major flaws in detail of the Bill, the principle appears to me and I might say to human rights associations, civil liberty groups and fair-minded people whom I have communicated with, to be absolutely above and beyond debate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate the obvious. This Party and this Premier stands committed to the advancement of human freedoms and liberties in the Province of Saskatchewan and this Bill is but one more arrow for the average person to use for his bow in his protection in today's complex world. When we vote for or against this Bill, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it that we shall be voting for or against the principle of advancement of human rights in the Province of Saskatchewan. That's the principle of this Bill. The principle is the establishment of an office to act for the little man of Saskatchewan, the ordinary individual, to help him in investigations and recommendation against administrative abuses if those should occur by the officials in our Government and in any subsequent governments. That is the real principle of this Bill and when you vote either for it or against it you are voting either for or against the advancement of human rights in Saskatchewan, make no mistake about that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I say to the Leader of the Opposition, I'm not going to vote against advancement of civil rights and civil freedoms. I am going to vote for it but what will the Liberal Opposition do, Mr. Speaker? This is a more difficult question than some might think. As I stand back and objectively try to assess the arguments of those who have spoken opposite I am totally confused as to what they, as a political party, really believe in the area of human rights. Individually, with respect, I say that some positions have been clearly stated by the Liberals opposite. With respect, their Leader, the Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) says simply that he is opposed in

principle because the area of protection that the Ombudsman would provide can now be handled or will be handled, I should put it that way more accurately, by an upgraded and a better MLA. That I think is a valid argument. I disagree with that proposition totally but I respect the Leader of the Opposition for clearly and concisely stating a philosophical point of view that presents itself as a clear alternative to the Bill that is before this House, as a clear alternative to the principle of the establishment of an Ombudsman office to investigate administrative actions. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, some Members say that I should withdraw the Bill. I want to say that this morning on the front pages of the Leader-Post there is a headline that says, "Government Members Applaud Steuart". I should like to read the article. It says this:

The Saskatchewan Legislature Monday was treated to a rare sight of Government Members applauding a Liberal who was opposing a Government measure. Dave Steuart, Leader of the Opposition, spoke against Government plans to set up an Ombudsman. A similar stand had been taken previously by other Opposition Members who had been later chastised by Government MLAs. In Mr. Steuart's case he presented an alternative that won desk-pounding applause from all present.

That's the way the article reads.

When ultimately he adjourned the debate and sat down many Government Members were nodding their heads in agreement.

That's the way the newspaper read. I want to say that I was one of those who applauded the Leader of the Opposition for his comment that the MLA should be upgraded. I want to say that I was one of those who nodded my head in agreement when he said that the MLAs' role should be improved and it should be given more prestige. But I also want to say that I was not one of those who applauded the suggestion concurrent to that which was that we should abolish the Ombudsman Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Although I can't speak for my colleagues in this House, either from this side or from your side, I'll bet my bottom dollar that those who applauded on this side applauded the remarks about upgrading the MLA but did not applaud his remarks which said that we should withdraw the Ombudsman Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I regret very much that type of a newspaper report, honest or otherwise, that conveyed that impression. But, in fact, I say this to the House that it was left ultimately to their Leader to try to focus the main opposition to this Bill and I will say a few words about his argument in a minute because I think they deserve some debate. But for the time being, Mr. Speaker, as I said, the Saskatchewan Human Rights Association and individuals are confused as to the position of the Liberal Party on this vital issue of human rights. They are confused, they will tell you.

First we have the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) who, I must say, was also clear in his submission. He says that you have 60 MLAs and you don't need an Ombudsman and I commend him for that position. But first of all trying to assess the position overall – here is the Member for Cannington, in a clear submission saying that 60 MLAs can do the job. Yet what does the Member from Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) his Party Whip say? He says that anybody who says that is speaking nonsense, 60 Members can't do the job and we need an Ombudsman. The Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. MacDonald) he says this; "I support the principle of the Bill but only for socialist states." As for the lawyer from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) he states that it is good even for those mildly, if I may call it, Mr. Speaker, mildly non-socialist states such as Alberta and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, just to name a few.

One Liberal Member for Moose Jaw says he supports it but only for socialist states. The Member for Lumsden says, I support it, I have to support it also for those which are non-socialist states. And the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) who in my view delivered one of the most confusing speeches that I have heard in a long time on any subject in this House. He stated that the Ombudsman is needed to check the administrative abuses of local government. Yet the Member for Lakeview, when I got up and asked my direct question, he said, "Oh, no. The Ombudsman shouldn't direct and interfere in local government." The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart), the Members for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) and from Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) they state that the Ombudsman costs too much.

Not so does our magnanimous and outspoken Whip from the Liberal Party. He says cost is no factor in an Ombudsman. He says that is not an argument against the principle of the Bill. Then we hear the Member from Albert Park say that the Attorney General and his Cabinet colleagues are making the Bill apply to everyone but themselves. The Cabinet are the ones who are exempt. "Not so", says the Member for Lakeview. He says the Ombudsman should not investigate the Attorney General and the Members of the Cabinet, courts, arbitrations. He said it shouldn't investigate those things that our Bill says it won't investigate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that hasn't left you confused and our public breathless as to what the Liberal Party position is on this principle of Human Rights, then allow me to remind you, Mr. Speaker, what they have to say about the "principle" about this Bill themselves.

The Member from Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) says that he supports the Bill in principle, no ands, buts or ifs, but he disapproves of this Bill because there are some bad sections in it. But he agrees with the principle of an Ombudsman. The Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) says, "I agree with the principle of an Ombudsman, but only for socialist states," whatever and whoever that covers. The Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) says, "I am sympathetic in principle to an Ombudsman Bill, but that is all and this is as far as I am going to go."

The Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) he is so confused by the talk of Members on the opposite side about the Ombudsman he says that he is not going to vote either one way or the other on the principle of the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: He doesn't know what he is going to do. He is going to abstain. As far as he is concerned I think that he is not so confused as he makes out because he is looking three years from now when his voting record might hurt his image with that young group 171 that he is thoroughly in favor with.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And he does not want to be put in that position, I am sure that is running through the mind of the Member for Albert Park, unfortunately having put himself on the record the other way. And then on the principle of the Bill the Members from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) and Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart), after all of these comments about the principle, they say, "We oppose the Bill, pure and simple."

Now, Mr. Speaker, today I went downstairs to the cafeteria and had a terrific bowl of borsch soup. It was terrific. But borsch soup, as all Members will know, has several different varieties of vegetables and meat in it. That is how the Liberal Party has approached this Bill. One Member slices something into the pot, the other one slices something else into the pot. The problem is that the borsch downstairs tasted good because there was one cook. Over there they have 15 confused cooks who don't know their stand on civil rights.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: Who was it that said that the Liberal Party, as a whole, is like the guy who sits on the fence but keeps his ear on the ground. Mr. Speaker, only the Liberals can achieve that, anatomically.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a Member of our Cabinet and a Party whose voice is clear to all of Saskatchewan in our commitment to individual rights.

Mr. MacLeod: — On a Point of Order. I didn't know whether he is going to come around a third time to these points or not, but I would like to catch him on one or two of these things as he goes by.

The first thing that he has done is simply misrepresented everything that I said.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. MacLeod: — I gather that . . . Well I would like to make my position clear.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! That is not a Point of Order, that is a debating order. If the Member is being misquoted he has the right at the end of the Member's speech to put the records straight. But this is not a Point of Order. A Point of Order is when the rules of the House are being broken, this is a

debating point.

Mr. MacLeod: — Okay, but it is great fun for him and if he wants to have sport that way, fine.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say to the junior Member from Albert Park that it is not great fun for me. I am very sorry that he took the type of tactics that he did and made the type of speech that he did in opposition to the Bill, because I have greater respect for the Opposition arguments, by the Leader, and I will come to them right now.

Mr. Speaker, I said that I wanted to deal with the arguments made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) in opposing this Bill. In summary he said that it was his view that MLAs, given the opportunity, could do the job of an Ombudsman. I agree with the argument that the role of the MLA must be generally upgraded by this House, but I say that the error that the Leader of the Opposition makes in this argument is to view the role of the Ombudsman and the role of the MLA to be basically incompatible or mutually exclusive. They are not. They are highly compatible and desirable in any democratic society. We can and must do both, namely to upgrade the role of the MLA while at the same time establishing the office of the Ombudsman to investigate administrative abuses.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — An MLA has many jobs. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition. One of which is to listen to individual grievances and to pursue them to the best of his ability. But that is not his only task. The MLA has the duty of presenting political ideas of his constituents in the best interest of the province in this Chamber the best he can. That means that he must have more time, better facilities, to listen and to debate issues that affect the very lives of the people of this Province.

That means more time and better opportunity to inform himself on the multiplicity and the complexity of issues in today's world. He can no longer come into this Chamber and make an off-the-cuff speech on a topic which may be so complex and important that its complexities have defied him. He must have time and opportunity to defend his views and to defend the views of his Party. He must have time to develop and articulate in speech and in writing and in personal contact, new ideas, new programs which can be used to the benefit of government in a society regardless of the political stripe of the government that is in power.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — In other words, Mr. Speaker, in my estimation the MLA is often the catalyst for social and economic change that this society is crying out for in the 1970s.

Would Members opposite not agree with me that if we freed the MLA from the job that he is really not equipped to do, namely, to process individual grievances to satisfactory

conclusion, would Members not agree with me that if we freed them of this chore that this would in itself be an upgrading of the role of the MLA. At the same time the Ombudsman can be the prodder, the person to better improve the impartial and fair administration of government.

The Ombudsman is not a panacea or a cure-all. He is one who seeks merely to expose and rectify administrative abuse. He has to do this task for the little man of Saskatchewan, the one who doesn't sometimes come to his MLA, on either side, the person who doesn't know what his rights and opportunities are.

Professor Rowatt of Carlton University describing the role of the Ombudsman said that the Ombudsman has two main strengths, persuasion and the Press. Unlike the MLA the Ombudsman is not a political figure. Therefore, unlike the MLA he does not involve himself in the emotional political feelings that the MLA must of necessity – he is only a human being – must of necessity relate to, when he receives an individual grievance.

The Ombudsman will be a listener, an adviser, a clearing house. In fact, in many ways, he will turn out to be an almost free legal adviser to people who have complaints about government. This Ombudsman, like any other, will be a watchdog over government's many complex departments. And that watchdog benefit will work to the advantage of all the people in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — His position will be just like that of the Auditor General or even some of the courts in the impartiality in the processing of claims.

Mr. Speaker, today, more than any other time in history we need to build into our system this extra means of seeking restitution and seeking a proper hearing before the Government of Saskatchewan as we are doing with the Ombudsman.

The ordinary citizen needs a single channel through which to make sure that the right administration decisions of government are always made.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, this Bill applies the principle of impartial adjudication to the areas of administrative discretion. This adjudication must be applied uniformly and consistently by one impartial, non-political person who builds up a body of precedents around him. I remind the House again that this Ombudsman will be a servant of the Legislature and the people, and not of any Cabinet Minister or any government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Thus I say to the Leader of the Opposition, that if you see that these roles are incompatible you are in error. They are complementary. With a strong MLA and a strong Ombudsman nobody loses, only democracy and all of society gains.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Therefore, I cannot

recommend to anybody in this House and I can't in conscience having introduced the Bill, agree to it being withdrawn, because I think that would be a weakening of the democratic institutions and a weakening of the civil liberties that we all say we are working towards. Only action will tell when we vote either against or for this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, there have been two other arguments briefly advanced in this House against the Bill. One argument is that the Bill is too restrictive in defining the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman.

The second argument is that the Attorney General has too wide powers as seen in Section 17. Let me reiterate – by any parliamentary standards if those arguments should be valid, they are arguments that go to details of the Bill and not to the principle. The principle of which the establishment of an office to check the administrative abuses by governments, is the principle the Leader of the Opposition disagrees with and says the MLA can do better. I have dealt with that argument but he obviously holds his view.

Let me deal briefly with the argument against the Bill, namely, that it is too restrictive. At the outset let me say that everywhere in the Western world it has been generally recognized as Professor Rowatt has said, that the powers of the Ombudsman basically are persuasion and the Press. The Ombudsman will use his persuasive powers in many ways, not the least of which, I remind Members will be the threat of reporting any undue or improper action by any Attorney General or Cabinet Minister to this House directly. It is in the Bill and I am sure the Members opposite no matter who the Opposition is of the day, will raise that for dispute and comment.

I want to say to the Members of the House and to the people of Saskatchewan that, with respect to this point, I think our reports and our Press, although I quarrel with them from time to time and certainly editorially, are tough, intelligent people who will do their part on the second arm of the Ombudsman's role with respect to the Press.

Mr. Speaker, I say with respect to this Bill and these powers this Bill No. 9 has placed no restrictions at all on the Ombudsman as made out by some Members opposite. The main jurisdictional section giving the Ombudsman authority is set out in Section 12, subsection (1).

Mr. Speaker, I am informed by my law officers, again, that notwithstanding any statements to the contrary by some opposite, the powers contained therein, are in terms substantially identical in every respect to those contained in the Province of Manitoba, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Alberta and the leader in this area, the country of New Zealand. To that general power given in Section 12 there were exceptions in our Bill. We admit that. These are specifically set out. In other jurisdictions such as Alberta, Newfoundland, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia the exceptions are not specifically enumerated as in our Bill, but they are there. They are there by virtue of certain definitions of the word 'officer' because the word officer is defined in a narrow way with respect to official and employee. And in those Bills it says the Ombudsman may investigate the administrative act of the officer.

And so we have to go back to the definition of 'officer', to see what types of conduct he can investigate. And in that area a Cabinet Minister is clearly not an officer. To clarify the matter so that it isn't disputed in a court of law, my Department rightly concluded that we should enumerate those exemptions that were left out in the other way by definition of 'officer', exemptions which are commonly and generally accepted to the field and the activity of the Ombudsman. Everybody knows about them! We have exempted the Cabinet. No one can realistically argue that a minister in a Cabinet who makes policy and does not deal with administrative matters should be included. Not even the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) would disagree that Parliament is supreme.

The former Attorney General, Mr. D.V. Heald, speaking against the Ombudsman Bill in 1965, even he recognized this area. He went on to say further that administrative acts only are the ones that can be considered. He also went on to say that there is no room for the Ombudsman in a Cabinet, in the courts, in the quasi-judicial tribunal, or any decisions of policy made by the minister or otherwise.

We have exempted the deputy minister and persons in that category. If there is not a deputy there has to be an acting deputy. There may be an associate deputy who has substantially the same function.

Mr. Steuart: — Or anybody else.

Mr. Romanow: — I'll come to that in a moment. What is a deputy in our parliamentary system? I remind all Members of this House that the law of this Province, of this land, says in The Interpretation Act that a deputy is a person who has in almost every material respect powers similar and identical — not obviously all of them because he can't go to the Cabinet room — but in every other way, substantially similar to those powers that the minister has and serves. It is stated as the law of the land.

This person serves as the chief policy adviser to his minister, at the highest level of policy making. He makes few, if any, administrative decisions or administrative acts that affects the rights of the individual.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — He's the chief administrator.

Mr. Romanow: — The Hon. Member from Milestone and I am not surprised that he makes the across-the-floor comment about the chief administrative officer, but if he used his deputy as a chief administrative officer, no wonder the Department of Welfare was in such a mess for seven years . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — . . . because there was no policy coming out of it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — The fact of the matter is that any deputy, any person who knows how government operates, knows that the deputy is in a chief policy and chief policy advising role to government.

We have exempted persons also — this is the part that the Leader of the Opposition is referring to — exempted persons who by their appointment are directly responsible to the minister.

Mr. Steuart: — Or anyone you designate.

Mr. Romanow: — I'll come to that in one minute.

Mr. Speaker, in one of the most ludicrous bits of extended logic, by some Members of this House — and I must say regretfully — by the Leader-Post editorially, they said this could mean the lowest ranked person of any department. I say to the Leader of the Opposition and to Members of this House the key words are directly responsible. No deputy minister or anyone beyond the deputy or his category, is directly responsible to him. There are departmental lines of authority and responsibility and people report to those immediately above them to whom they are directly responsible. I suppose by a grand extension of logic, you could find that ultimately the man who is driving a car from the garage to the Legislative Buildings from time to time is directly responsible. But that is unreasonable interpretation. This is a ludicrous interpretation to be put on by any person of this House. These people do not occupy that type of position. What we intend by this section — the key words are 'directly responsible' — apart from the deputy are those people such as executive assistants and special assistants, people whose main job is to assist the minister and the deputy in the formulation of policy and programs. Here it is primarily the deputy. These people do not occupy any position similar to any lower officer of a department or agency of government. And if the Members say that they do they are simply not playing fair ball with the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — They are directly responsible to and perform functions only as delegated to them by the minister. Now lest there be any doubt in anyone's mind about the effect of this section, this is the general section, I state again, that it applies only to those directly responsible to the minister in the normal and ordinary meaning of the words it is not fair or accurate for the Press or anyone to misinterpret those words.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I do not believe that any one would argue against the exemptions as they relate to courts and to tribunals.

Now the second argument relates to the powers of the Attorney General. It was the powers the Leader of the Opposition was referring to. I think they can be fairly summarized as in Section 17. Section 17 says the Attorney General can certify something not to be in the public interest and the Ombudsman

can't investigate it. So I think basically the argument is generated around that because that is the all powerful section to use a word that's been thrown out in debate. I say again, to the Member from Albert Park – he disappointed me personally when he argued that the power in this Bill resides with the Attorney General – I tell you why. Let me just briefly describe the role of the Attorney General in any government, Liberal, NDP or Conservative. It has been generally stated that an Attorney General occupies somewhat of a different position than other Cabinet Ministers. He is at once a politician committed to a political belief and advocating certain points of view at the same time he is the chief law administration officer in Saskatchewan. Members might be surprised to know that according to The Attorney General Act of this Province, an Attorney General acts as the official legal advisor to Cabinet. He oversees administration of justice. He advises on statutes, he has the regulation and conduct of all litigation. He has a wide multiplicity of powers contained in The Attorney general's Act. They are awesome powers in the Department of Attorney General Act. Awesome for a person who at the same time belongs to a government with an obvious political belief whether it is Liberal or NDP or Conservative. And I want to say very seriously that I take my responsibilities, political and legal in this capacity very seriously. But I, like other Attorney Generals have another power, and that is a power conferred on me by virtue of Section 508 of the Federal Criminal Code of Canada.

Members might be surprised to know that I have the power, in any criminal matter, to file what is known as a stay of proceedings. And the matter can't be heard and can't be adjudicated in a court of law. That means as Attorney General I could determine in the public interest whether a charge ought to be stayed. I'd have to weigh the use of that power very, very carefully, quite obviously. Former Attorney General have done it. I am sure they have done it only after a great deal of concern to make sure they are making the right decision. I could determine in the public interest that a criminal proceeding should be stayed by filing a certificate of stay. All judicial proceedings come to an immediate halt. That decision cannot be questioned by the courts, it can't be questioned anywhere but here in this Legislature of Saskatchewan. The Members from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) and Lumsden (Mr. Lane) both being respected lawyers for whom I have respect know these powers of the Attorney General, the power of general stay. Would they ever say that those powers in the criminal code of stay should be removed from the Attorney General? Would the Member for Albert Park say that? If the answer is no, as it must be, then how in the world could it logically be argued that a similar, but lesser legal power, I remind the Members, should not similarly reside with the Attorney General in the Ombudsman Bill?

Mr. Steuart: — Because you are investigating yourself that's why.

Mr. Romanow: — I'll tell you why.

Mr. Steuart: — Covering up that's why.

Mr. Romanow: — Leader of the Opposition says because we are covering up.

Mr. Steuart: — Protection for yourself.

Mr. Romanow: — Covering up. What happens if there should be a charge with respect to a criminal matter that involves a Member of either this side or that side of the House or a political matter?

Mr. Steuart: — Everything the Ombudsman does is for a political matter.

Mr. Romanow: — I'm asking this question of the Member, supposing there is a charge of a criminal matter involving anybody on this side or anybody of that side, do you suggest that they Attorney General should not have the power to file the stay if it is deemed proper to do it? Do you say that an Attorney General would abuse his power if he didn't have valid grounds to use this power before justice? Do you think that an Attorney General similarly by the Ombudsman Bill would use his power to thwart justice in the hearings of the Ombudsman without the biggest ruckus being raised in Saskatchewan? If you are saying that then you are being hypocritical and untruthful to the Province of Saskatchewan because you don't believe it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I want to give you an example of how this type of situation could arise, Mr. Leader of the Opposition. Suppose the Ombudsman . . .

Mr. Steuart: — . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Romanow: — Just listen to this, you might learn. Suppose the Ombudsman seeks to investigate an administrative act that has come to his attention by virtue of some complainant. Some bureaucrat or some official has carried out an administrative act. The man who is offended goes to the Ombudsman and concurrently that same administrative act is the subject of criminal investigation leading to possible criminal prosecution. Do you mean to tell me that in that situation the Ombudsman should be allowed to continue, thereby, possibly endangering the entire operation of the criminal code and the law of this country? What is the Attorney General supposed to do in the public interest like that?

Mr. Steuart: — Make it narrow.

Mr. Romanow: — Right, it is a very narrow power.

Mr. Steuart: — Then make it narrow.

Mr. Romanow: — I'm saying its going to be narrow and I'm saying to you as I am saying to the people of Saskatchewan that any Attorney General, I don't care who it is, Roy Romanow or Liberal Attorney General or whoever, any Attorney General who uses this power under Section 17 even with a suspicion of abuse of power, has entirely brought the Bill into disrepute and himself into disrepute as he would if he did the same thing with a stay of proceedings criminally. And no man who acts honestly and intelligently wouldn't believe that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now, he says to me, define it narrowly. I should like to define it narrowly. We worked on the Bill for months and we can't define it narrowly. The best Bill that we could seek couldn't define it narrowly. Now some Members of the Press on the editorial page will realize that because I am afraid some of them have also misconstrued this editorially. And while I am on my feet I may say I am also disappointed with respect to the editorial in the Leader-Post. They hold inconsistent points of view. For four years that I have been an MLA in opposition, I stand to be corrected, there should have been at least one editorial on human rights coming forth from the Leader-Post, but I never saw it when I was in opposition. Now all of a sudden we come in with a Human Rights Bill and they say you have got too much power with the Human Rights Commission. We come in with the Ombudsman Bill they say you don't give them enough power. What in the world do they want? Mr. Speaker, I say those who have criticized Section 17 were either ignorant of the law or they had motivations purely for political reasons to destroy the credibility of the Ombudsman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — One or the other. One thing that I will not say of the Member from Albert Park is that he was ignorant of law, because he isn't. He is a good lawyer. That is what I repeat openly again the arguments of the learned gentlemen opposite from Albert Park and Lumsden have been nothing short, nothing short of political and intellectual dishonesty.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, this Bill has been discussed with the Saskatchewan Human Rights Association and other interested persons, interested in the advancement of human rights. I haven't heard them criticize the Bill and neither have you gentlemen opposite. I believe they applaud the actions of the Government as do all fair minded persons. Mr. Speaker, we have a mandate from the people to implement human rights legislation, legislation which was denied and thwarted for seven long years by the Liberal Party opposite. Mr. Speaker, we want this Bill to work. In that regard I urge all MLAs to lay aside deeply felt political prejudices and support the Government in this endeavor. I'll try to lay aside mine. Although Section 17 is totally justifiable, and may yet be proven necessary when the situation arises, I think there is a more important principle involved here and that is that we try to get the support of the Members opposite who are I think basically the only group opposed to this Bill in Saskatchewan. I can't see any other opposition. I have no letters opposing the Bill, I have no letters condemning Section 17. I have a letter suggesting something with Section 17. I'm going to deal with it in just one-half second, but nothing opposing the principle of the Bill. I say we are dealing with a higher principle here. I think it is important that we try once more to get the support of the Members opposite so that Saskatchewan's Ombudsman will have their confidence too as it has the confidence of the people of the Province. And for that reason, I'm going to advise the House that I will propose a House amendment to delete Section 17

and invite the Liberals to join us in supporting the Bill on second reading.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Let us all get behind this Bill, Mr. Speaker. Let us all get behind this Bill, let's make this office work. With experience and knowledge we will be able to further and to strengthen it. That's going to be our honest intention. Mr. Speaker, we can make this an advancement and as I said at the beginning a credit to our society and a credit to all Members of the House if we will co-operate. I urge you again to join us. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have been a Member of a Government who has seen fit to introduce this Bill and it is a personal privilege for me to move second reading of this historical Bill, Bill 9.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS – 40
Messieurs

Blakeney	Dyck	Meakes
Smishek	Wood	Romanow
Messer	Snyder	Kramer
Thibault	Larson	Baker
Brockelbank	MacMurchy	Pepper
Byers	Thorson	Kwasnica
Carlson	Engel	Tchorzewski
Richards	Owens	Matsalla
Cowley	Taylor	Faris
Cody	Gross	Feduniak
Mostoway	Comer	Rolfes
Lange	Hanson	Oliver
Feschuk	Kaeding	Flasch
MacLeod		

NAYS – 11
Messieurs

Steuart	Loken	Grant
Boldt	MacDonald (Milestone)	McIsaac
Gardner	Weatherald	McPherson
MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)	Wiebe	

ROYAL ASSENT

At 3:37 o'clock His Honour the Lieutenant Governor having entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the Throne and gave Royal Assent to the Bills presented to him.

MOTION FOR FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

Mr. Speaker: — May it please Your Honour: This Legislative Assembly has voted supplies required to enable the Government to defray

March 30, 1972

the expenses of the Public Service. In the name of the Assembly I present Your Honour the following Bill:

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year ending the Thirty-first day of March, 1973, to which Bill I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent:

Royal Assent was then given to this Bill and His Honour retired from the Chamber at 3:41 o'clock p.m.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Snyder that **Bill No. 26 – An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, 1967** – be now read a second time.

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, in connection with this Bill I asked that it stand while I got some additional information. I am not sure yet whether I have it or not, possibly the Hon. Minister (Mr. Snyder) in closing the debate can tell me the answer to it.

In Section 17A reference is made to the discontinuance of part or all of the business and I should like to know what constitutes a part, is it 50 per cent of the employees, 50 per cent of the sales, or just what is it that constitutes that part? Also what constitutes 'winding up in part'?

Another thing that bothered me a bit was that in some union agreements I believe and I was trying to ascertain this, there is provision for severance pay, separation or severance pay to individuals and this is negotiated with unions the same time as their other agreements. This could be construed as being part or in whole compensation for the loss of the employer's share of the contributions to a pension scheme. I should like to know the application of this Bill when such agreements might exist in union agreements?

The other question I have is, there is quite a difference looking at it from the employer's viewpoint as to whether the individual is going to withdraw his deposits and also take the employer's deposits, or whether he takes a paid-up annuity. I should like some enlightenment on this particular section. If we can have a further elaboration on these two questions I feel we can support the Bill.

Hon. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps it might have been as well to get into the particulars of the Act in Committee, but perhaps I can give the Member from Whitmore Park my impression of what is intended by 17A or that portion of the Act which refers to the winding up of a portion of the operation. I think the idea that occurs to me at the moment would be the case of the Burns and Company operation which is being phased out when the Regina operation is part of a larger portion of the operation that is situated elsewhere. To all intents and purposes a portion of the operation is wound up and under those circumstances the employees could expect then upon the winding

up of the operation and the winding up of the pension fund, that they should receive the contribution which they have made and the contribution which the employer has made on their behalf, which is regarded as a wage, as a deferred wage, which has in essence been earned but placed into that retirement fund.

I think the Member from Whitmore Park also directed attention to the problem of a paid-up annuity and the manner in which this would be applied. I believe in that case, provided the date of termination occurred after the date the superintendent declared the pension plan wound up, then he would be entitled to his vested interest in the employer's contribution just as though the pension plan had been wound up on the date upon which his employment was terminated. If the vested employer contribution under those circumstances will not purchase an annuity of \$10 or more then he would be entitled to a lump-sum refund of the employer's vested contributions.

The Member also raised a question with respect to severance pay and how severance pay might affect this particular provision. I think they have to be regarded as two separate functions. Severance pay is generally, as the Member suggested, a matter which is negotiated in the event of termination, so many weeks of wages are determined to be paid on the basis of the number of years worked. I think that they stand separately. The pension contribution and severance pay have to be regarded as being two different and separate privileges that are enjoyed by those who are unfortunate, I would say, to be laid off before the time of normal retirement.

To wind up, Mr. Speaker, I think the legislation is good legislation. Experience has shown that most employers when they are in the process of winding up their operation begin at a point somewhat previous to the winding up date to reduce their staff over a period of time and it means that those employees who are terminated previous to the actual winding up are placed in a position of disadvantage, while those who are around when the pension plan and the operation is finally concluded receive the benefits not only of their own contribution but also of the employers. So I think in basic terms it solves one of the problems that came upon us somewhat by accident but there have been deliberate attempts on the part of some employers to avoid an obligation by progressively laying off their employees over a fairly long period of time in order to escape an obligation. This legislation which is also in effect in other jurisdictions, I believe, is a progressive step and one which will be I think generally accepted in all of the pension plans in the near future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of **Bill No. 76 – An Act to amend The Cancer Control Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill contains only one amendment. For many years a trust fund has been maintained for each of the two cancer clinics in Regina and Saskatoon. Donations and bequest from interested patients and relatives are placed

in these funds and are used for the betterment of the clinics. There is no specific legislation or legislative authority for these funds to be maintained. The proposed amendment, therefore, authorizes the establishment and maintenance of these trust funds. It is also provided that these trust funds will be administered in accordance with the regulations made by the Treasury Board and will be audited by the Provincial Auditor. These two provisions are in accordance with the existing practice and are standard functions for the Treasury Board and the Provincial Auditor. I am pleased to recommend this amendment for the approval of the Members of the Legislature and, therefore, move second reading of Bill No. 76.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of **Bill No. 77 – An Act to provide for The education of Ancillary Dental Personnel.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, last June when the New Democratic Party sought its mandate for the people of Saskatchewan we promised to provide dental care for children under the age of 12. Mr. Speaker, quite clearly the people of Saskatchewan needed and wanted a dental care program for their children. The Ancillary Dental Personnel Education Bill which we have introduced provides the function upon which to develop a dental program. This Bill provides for the education of people who are needed in large numbers to staff the children's dental care program which we are now developing. This new legislation for the education of ancillary dental personnel is a landmark in Saskatchewan health care. It is clear evidence that the NDP Government is moving quickly to fulfil its promises and commitments to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, our Party introduced a comprehensive Hospitalization Program in the late 1940s and early 1950s. In the 1960s we introduced comprehensive Medical Care coverage and now in the 1970s the NDP Government will introduce dental care. It is a solid list of firsts which is recognized and accepted throughout North America. When we introduced our hospitalization program in the 1940s we were told that it would not be financially possible. We were told that a government could never offer a hospitalization program. But, a CCF Government could not ignore the terrible suffering of people who did not have access to hospital services and would never receive hospital services if the Government did not intervene. We provided hospitalization for Saskatchewan. We proved that people working together through their government could provide good hospital care at reasonable costs. Eventually all provinces in Canada followed the lead of Saskatchewan to ensure that all people could obtain hospital services. Our experience with medical care was no different. We pioneered a great program which provided the people with a service they wanted and that they deserved. We faced great problems when we introduced the Medical Care Insurance Program but our program has been a proven success. So great a success that it was demanded by other people in other provinces right across Canada. The success of these two programs is indicative of what a government can do if it wants to. But it is clear that most governments are unable to accomplish what an NDP Government can do, because the NDP Government provides positive leadership, it is socially aware, it responds to the wishes of the people, it is not

frightened to fight the vested interest groups on behalf of its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, our Government knows that one of the important unmet health needs today is dental care. I should like the Members of this Assembly to know some of the facts about the present state of dental care in the Province of Saskatchewan. A survey conducted shows that children ages 7 to 17 in Saskatchewan indicated that fully 75 per cent of the seven-year-old children in the province had suffered tooth decay, most of these young children, in fact, 58 per cent were in need of dental treatment. Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to repeat, 58 per cent of the tooth decay in seven-year-old children in Saskatchewan needed treatment. This is an alarming situation. For the older age group, the situation is even worse. Of the 11-year-old children 80 per cent, that is four out of five children, have suffered tooth decay. By the time we get to the 17-year-olds almost all children have had tooth decay, 98 per cent to be exact. Not only are 98 per cent of the 17 year old children affected by tooth decay but on the average these young adults have nine teeth either missing or affected by decay seriously. This is almost unbelievable.

If dental problems are not treated additional problems develop over a period of time. Why do these dreadful conditions exist, Mr. Speaker? To answer this question we must look at the existing dental service system and determine why the system fails so badly. The present system of providing dental care relies extensively on treatment being provided by dentists in private practice. I believe that the failure is that we have placed too much emphasis on treatment of dental disease and not sufficient emphasis on prevention. Also we have relied on highly trained personnel, the professional dentists to provide many of the services which could be provided equally as effectively by persons with lesser training. This heavy reliance on dentists is particularly inappropriate in Saskatchewan for two reasons. First there are not enough dentists to do the job and there is reason to believe the situation is not going to improve over the next fifteen years. Secondly the dentists we do have are badly distributed throughout the province. At the present there is very little anyone can do about this. In Saskatchewan at the end of the last year we had 185 active private practice dentists or one dentist for about every 5,000 people. If we counted all the dentists registered in the province, we had 215, or about one dentist for every 4,400 residents. This compares to a ratio of one dentist to every 2,000 people in Canada as a whole.

A survey by the Canadian Dental Association in 1968 revealed that in Saskatchewan only 7 per cent of the dentists thought they could handle more work. At the same time 58.3 per cent of Saskatchewan dentists thought they were too busy. This means that most dentists in Saskatchewan feel they are overworked now. Yet let me remind you that we face a terrible backlog of dental disease in the province. A related problem in the distribution of dentists within the province is this. We have over 20 communities in Saskatchewan with 1,000 or more population which do not have a resident dentist. In no place is there poorer distribution of dentists more clearly evident than in the northern part of the province. Over half of all dentists in Saskatchewan are located in the cities of Regina and Saskatoon. We would have thought that the new Dental School in Saskatchewan would have enabled the province to

overcome some of the shortage of dentists and this would have improved the situation of dentists in the Province of Saskatchewan. I have discovered that this is not the case. The new graduates from the Saskatchewan Dental School will have little impact in Saskatchewan until some time in the 1980s. The number of dentists trained in Saskatchewan's Dental School is so small that it will barely replace the number of dentists who will retire, die or move out of the province in the next 10 years. Mr. Speaker, under the present system there is no reason to suspect that any new dentists establishing practices in Saskatchewan will locate in the smaller populated centres in the province or in rural practice. The attraction of the large cities seems to be too great for the dentists. This observation has been found to be true in other parts of Canada where governments have given substantial incentives to dentists if they will locate in rural and out-of-the-way centres.

I have been told by my colleagues in other provinces that some of these very generous incentive grants have received very few applicants. Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan the costs of dental service for the average citizen often amount to a real financial burden even though they can find a dentist who will serve them. The cost of paying a dentist to provide preventive services seems a luxury one can ill afford after paying for emergency needs. In light of the serious state of our dental health in Saskatchewan and the existing financial burden in paying for dental services I was disappointed, Mr. Speaker, when the Dental Association raised its fees by 20 per cent very recently. In the case of the social service beneficiaries they are asking the Department for an increase of 35 per cent. This kind of unilateral action is very difficult for the public to understand. I believe that many of the health professional groups who bill the government or individual citizens for their services are charging or requesting unreasonable fees when one looks at their overall total income.

Members of the Legislature may also be interested in knowing that the optometrists want a very large increase in what we have been paying on behalf of the social assistance cases. We have been paying them 30 per cent of their fee schedule for ophthalmic dispensing, now they want 85 per cent, an increase of 183 per cent in one year is their request, Mr. Speaker. I can assure you that we cannot afford to meet these kinds of demands.

Because of these problems and other failures in the dental system in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, we intend to introduce a different type of dental service for children. The new program will make use of new types of dental personnel. The dental care program for children will emphasize prevention and early treatment. Services will largely be provided through dental therapists whose training will be made possible by passing the legislation before you. The dental therapists and other ancillary dental personnel will be sufficiently trained to provide most preventive dental services and some of the simpler restorative services. These restorative services would include filling teeth and extracting teeth in certain circumstances. This is not a completely new program, Mr. Speaker. Other countries such as New Zealand, Denmark and Great Britain have been using ancillary dental personnel in this role for many years, I understand in case of New Zealand for almost 50 years. The success of these programs has been well documented. In Saskatchewan, we have for over one year been operating in the Oxbow district an experimental dental program for school children. As the Hon. Members know the program is financed by the

Government of Canada, it is a pilot project which has been worked out between the Department of Health, the dentists and the dental school. The Oxbow School Dental Program has met with great success and is well accepted by the residents of the area. Our experience with this program will be most valuable in establishing a province-wide dental program for children. In the Swift Current Health Region a publicly financed dental program has been operating for many years. This program has demonstrated that administratively it is possible for the Government to operate a dental service. The most important part of a dental program is the preventive aspect. I have said on many occasions that I believe that our health programs are oriented to sickness and are primarily sickness programs. This is also true in case of the dental health, too much of our emphasis and primarily all of our emphasis is concentrated on curing the measure not preventing the measure.

We must improve the dental education information which our citizens receive so that they can more effectively maintain their dental health. The Government can assist communities in a number of other ways. The assistance of the fluoridation program is one which in many parts of this Province is one area where I believe the public sector is failing its responsibility. We must quit taking a casual attitude towards what is a very serious health problem. Mr. Speaker, I might point out that in the case of the northern part of the province our health officers tell me that in the native communities, on the reserves, we have children that all that they left is the roots and the stumps in their mouth, all the teeth have been decayed because of diet and because of lack of provision of dental care. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George Mitchell in an article, *The False Economy of Dental Neglect* pointed out and I quote:

Preventive measures would reduce the cost to the public substantially in terms of money saved, time saved, pain and discomfort avoided and prevention of personal appearance.

In other article he had this to say about the various types of dental disease and have one thing in common, namely:

They are progressive and permanent in each condition which requires individual treatment on the basis of adequate examination and diagnosis. For these diseases there are no known cures, they are not self-correcting. Once they begin to attack they can be controlled only through regular, continual, and costly treatment.

By careful planning and through active consultation with the School of Dentistry at the University and the College of Dental Surgeons we are confident that we will provide a dental program which adequately meets the needs of the residents of the Province of Saskatchewan. A dental program which can be accomplished within the financial capacity of the Government of Saskatchewan. Planning for the dental program is continuing but we intend to depend mainly upon the ancillary personnel whose training will be provided for under this legislation. We hope to enrol, Mr. Speaker, at least 50 students in a new program to begin training these ancillary dental personnel in the fall of 1972.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — As students from these two-year training programs graduate we will introduce our dental program. The children's dental program is based on Saskatchewan people, serving Saskatchewan people. This program will provide many opportunities for the young people of Saskatchewan to find satisfying and rewarding employment in the Province of Saskatchewan. I have no doubts that in the years ahead this dental program will meet the same success as did the hospitalization and the medical care programs and will be copied by other provinces in the Dominion of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, The Ancillary Dental Personnel Education Act is the beginning of a major new health program for the people of Saskatchewan. It gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to move second reading of Bill No. 77, An Act to provide The education of Ancillary Dental Personnel.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, once again the Minister of Health has spoiled an otherwise good speech and a good program by his references to political implications. One would feel from listening to the first parts of his observations that little or nothing was done by the previous Government, that all the goodies emanate from the powers who are opposite.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — I was amazed, Mr. Speaker, to find him saying that he and his associates don't mind challenging the vested interests. Then in the next breath he pointed out that the pilot scheme now in successful operation in the Oxbow area was brought about to a large extent by the co-operation of the Dental College and the dentists of the province. I think he gave credit earlier in the House to our Government for initiating this project with the financial backing of the Federal Government. This was certainly not initiated by the NDP.

Now I'm not going to beat the drums for the dentists, they are quite able to do that themselves, but I would point out to the Hon. Member that not too many years ago the co-operation on the part of the dentists for the use of ancillaries was not forthcoming. I give credit for the success of the establishment of the Oxbow unit to a man who is sitting in the Speaker's Gallery today, Dr. Currie, the Director of the Dental Branch of the Department of Health. I also give credit to Dr. Currie for his role in convincing the dentists of this Province that they should be receptive to the role of the ancillary and it was his work that brought this about. I believe the dental profession is very receptive to this now, although I'm a little puzzled when the Minister says that he has made the Bill available to the Dental College and as yet has not heard from them.

Mr. Speaker, as I have more that I should like to comment on in connection, with this Bill, I ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of **Bill No. 71 – An Act to amend The Power Corporation Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to enlighten the Members with reference to the amendment to The Power Corporation Bill the reason for the amendment is related to the understanding of the term 'net sum borrowed'. If I may give an example to illustrate, if the Province were to borrow \$20 million for which the lender pays say \$99 per \$100, has the Province really in fact borrowed \$20 million or \$19,800,000? The lawyers tell us that there could be confusion and accordingly suggest the alternative wording which includes the phrase 'principal amount of outstanding bonds'. The word 'principal' clearly refers to the \$20 million in the foregoing illustration. Therefore, the last part of subsection (1) Section 42 which now reads – 'except where the borrowing is for the purpose of paying in whole or in part any indebtedness previously incurred for the purposes of this Act', has been amended to say 'unless the borrowing is for the purpose of paying in whole or in part any indebtedness previously incurred for the purpose of this Act'.

This, I believe, covers the situation also where if we were to have \$640 million or of the authority which has been used and \$20 million of it matures and has to be repaid by borrowing, an example would be refunding operations, in this case the \$650 million would be exceeded if the \$20 million was added, but inasmuch as the borrowing is to repay the original \$20 million it will not have to be added to the \$640 million and thereby causing the excess of the \$650 million's ceiling.

The amendment to Section 3 I think is self-explanatory in regard to the valuation of Canadian dollars as par with United States dollars.

Having made these few remarks in regard to what I term a housekeeping amendment, Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill, An Act to amend The Power Corporation Act be given second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education) moved second reading of **Bill No. 74 – An Act to amend The Trade Schools Regulation Act.**

He said: The amendment to Bill No. 74, The Trade Schools Regulation Act, is being made to dovetail with a Bill introduced by the Attorney General on sales of training courses, Bill No. 66 which is now in Committee of the Whole.

Courses that are handled by correspondence will no longer be covered by this Act and reference to them is being deleted.

Mr. Speaker, this is merely a housekeeping amendment and I would be very pleased to move that it now be read a second time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of **Bill No. 75 – An Act to amend The Veterinary Services Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is also a housekeeping amendment. As Hon. Members will know we announced in the Budget Speech that we would be providing more money for the establishment of veterinary clinics throughout the Province of Saskatchewan. The Veterinary Services Act as it now reads allows a maximum \$8,000 to be made available to those districts from the Government at the present time. In order for us to provide the \$15,000 that we said we would make available for the establishment of veterinary clinics in districts or regions we have to amend Section 9, subsection (2) to raise the ceiling to something higher than the \$8,000 limit which it now restricts us to. Therefore, we are asking that we amend that sum of money to a higher amount, to the amount of \$30,000 so we shall have the opportunity to provide the \$15,000 for the establishment of the veterinary clinics, also giving us some further leeway in regard to providing other money to provide better and extended service to those districts.

I hope by doing this, Mr. Speaker, we shall not only increase the number of veterinary clinics in the Province of Saskatchewan but it may make it more desirable for those who are graduating from our College in Saskatoon to look at practices in Saskatchewan rather than at smaller animal practices in other provinces, such as Manitoba and Alberta.

Having made these few brief remarks to what I refer as a housekeeping amendment, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of an Act to amend The Veterinary Services Act.

Mr. D.F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I think that there are implications in this Bill that certainly might be considered more than housekeeping. There is some considerable problem with the construction of veterinary clinics and my colleague the Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) has some considerable remarks to make about this and I beg leave to adjourn.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:35 o'clock p.m.